CUSA

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION

SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
HELD ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1994 AT 6:30 P.M.
IN H-762, SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS CAMPUS

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION

ASSOCIATION DES ÉTUDIANTS ET ÉTUDIANTES DE L'UNIVERSITÉ CONCORDIA

Documents Considered:

BD-D1: Reasoned Report on Final Constitutional Reform Package

BD-D2: Changes to the Report on Final Constitutional Reform Package

1.0 ROLL CALL

PRESENT

CO-PRESIDENTS
Philip Dalton
Lana Grimes

COMMERCE
Kristina Bolh
Emmanuel Kamukama

FINE ARTS
Jonathan Asencio
Jonathan Carruthers
Aimée Darcel

ARTS AND SCIENCE
Nada Al-Yazdi
Alan Feldman
Wissam Jawad
Ken McMurray
Christine Vieira
Pascale Batchoun
Genevieve Grenier

ENGINEERING
Shadi Khader
Andrew Kennedy
Len Podgurny

ABSENT

Arts & Science: Marilyne Boyer, Helen Ora Cohen, Shafik Mina

Commerce & Administration: Andrea Fernandez

☐ **SGW** 1455 DE MAISONNEUVE W, SUITE 637, MONTREAL QC H3G 1M8 TEL (514) 848 7474 FAX (514) 848 7450
☐ **LOY** 7141 SHERBROOKE W, S.C. 103, MONTREAL QC H4B 1R6 TEL (514) 848 7440 FAX (514) 848 7426

2.0 CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, G. Dubrow, called this meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. The Chair stated that this meeting has been called under Section 5.6.4 of the constitution. The Co-Presidents may call this meeting without the usual notice if the present directors accept the meeting, and if the absent directors waive notice in writing of the meeting. He added that though the constitution does not specify when these waivers have to be provided, he recommends they should be handed in within five school days.

The Chair stated that not until all waiver forms are received can any decisions made or motions adopted or rescinded at this meeting be legal.

P. Dalton asked where the chair received this information. He stated that unless someone complains, that which happens is legitimate. He cited an example from a Board of Governors meeting.

The Chair stated that he will go by his information and will require waivers from absent members of the Board.

L. Grimes stated she believed it would be wise if the Board went into a Committee of the Whole, and without a lot of formality, she can explain the changes that are before the Board and they can be discussed and voted upon in a Committee of the Whole, the final decisions being made in regular session.

3.0 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

L. Podgurny asked where the agenda is. L. Grimes replied that there are only two points on the agenda, the constitution and a very brief CUSAcorp report.

MOTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA

Moved by: G. Grenier
Seconded by: P. Dalton

VOTE ON MOTION **UNANIMOUS**

MOTION TO GO INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: K. McMurray

VOTE ON MOTION **UNANIMOUS**

The Chair explained that a Committee of the Whole means the discussion can be informal and that an interim chair is selected.

A. Feldman is accepted as Chair of Committee of the Whole.

4.0 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

L. Grimes stated that after the last meeting of the Board, it was clear that there were some justifiable concerns regarding the motions discusses. She stated that during the Reading Week she asked students what they thought about the constitutional package, what they knew about it and so forth. She stated she found the students were confused and felt alienated and even cynical about the reform.

L. Grimes stated that as a result she is putting before the Board several recommendations that she feels focus on weaknesses of the reform package, and that make for a more comprehensible and understandable package.

L. Grimes stated that in the removal process in the initial package there is no provision for a member to run again if s/he has been absent. She stated that she believes that this takes away the very basic fundamental right that any member of the association has to be able to go back to their constituency for re-election.

L. Grimes stated that the second major change has to do with electing the president along with the vice-president Administration as a team. She added that she has outlined what she thinks are the most important reasons for having the two as opposed to just an elected president.

L. Grimes stated that the third major change is in the Faculty Association scheme. She stated that in the initial package there was seats for each faculty including independent students collectivity, and that the representatives came to the Board of Directors directly appointed by their faculties. She stated that this would ultimately render the Board one-third appointed and two-thirds elected.

L. Grimes proposed the formation of a Senate of Faculty Associations so that faculties without a formal association can be assured of being heard. She added that it would allow each faculty to send three representatives to Senate, which would have two powers, one to review decisions made by this Board, and two to bring motions to the Board with ex-officio voting status.

L. Grimes briefly went over the points in the Student Government Reform Package. (BD-D1)

L. Podgurny asked if the president and the VP Administration run as a slate. L. Grimes replied that the presidential system answers the question of who is in charge, but it leaves a hole with respect to what is positive about the Co-presidential system, namely that with two campuses there is broader representation, that students can see in two people more things that they like, and that there is an internal check-and-balance.

L. Grimes elaborated that the Co-presidential system is beneficial in that it brings diverse representation together. She added however that there has to be one person who is in charge. She stated that in the case of a vacancy, with an elected VP Administration there would be a logical replacement to fill the vacancy.

L. Grimes stated that in selecting a team you are seeing more of the presidents character in who s/he selects as a running mate. As well, the students will know that with two individuals, one can serve as a check for the other.

P. Dalton reiterated that having two running mates makes the process of replacing one, should they have to vacate their position, much easier.

P. Dalton stated that the package as it is now makes more sense. He added that in the case of the Senate of Faculty Associations, the appointed and elected positions in the same body does not make sense, but he votes to send it to the students. He added that the Board structure as it is now does not really change.

P. Dalton stated that there is not only one student union on campus, there are three. He added that some may say CUSA represents all students, but some may say the opposite. He stated that while some ECA members may wish to have appointees on the CUSA Board, he is quite sure some CASA members do not. He added that this leaves the CUSA Board to the CUSA constituents, who are allowed to elect people, and that makes sense.

L. Podgurny stated that it is very important to have representation coming from CUSA back to those groups. He added that there are many times that situations occur in the university where more would be accomplished if all groups worked together. He stated that the biggest thing to be gained from this system is that the power of three groups could work towards problems.

L. Podgurny stated that he is wary of the percentage of the appointed positions and stated that it may be a dangerous precedent to set, especially since the structures are not yet in place.

L. Podgurny asked if the VP Administration's mandate is compatible with the position that they would take. P. Dalton stated that the duties would be the same, adding the mandate to take over for the President.

L. Grimes stated that the VP Administration would also chair the Electoral Board.

S. Khader asked about the format of the question that will go to the students. L. Grimes replied that her preference would be to present the package as a whole, but if the Board is concerned, it could also be presented as a YES/NO vote on each of ten questions, but they should all be on the same page.

S. Khader stated that he felt it was not a good idea to have the package voted on as a whole, and that it would be better to have a vote on the separate questions, so that if an individual is opposed to one question, the entire ballot need not be defeated.

C. Vieira asked for clarification regarding the role of the VP Administration.

L. Grimes stated that there would be a very clear job description for all of the VPs, including the elected VP Administration. She added that these descriptions would be included in the Regulations, so that there is no ambiguity regarding jobs. She stated that the VP Administration would be in charge of the Electoral Board, the CUSA clubs, internal operations of the association and so forth.

C. Vieira asked why the VP Administration was chosen. L. Grimes replied that she did not look at the present VP positions to decide upon one, she just chose VP Administration as a title.

C. Vieira asked what would happen to the job of the VP Administration if for some reason that individual had to take over the job of the President. L. Grimes replied that many of the areas of the job are self-sufficient, and can take care of themselves for a time.

P. Dalton stated that the support functions of the VPs help the President, and that even this year the VPs have many times helped out the Co-Presidents by performing duties outside of their portfolios.

C. Vieira asked if the future portfolio of the VP Administration will be the same as it is now. She asked if any VP could become a president.

P. Dalton stated that this individual will be elected. He added that it is possible for the VP to perform duties of internal support as well as the Administrative portfolio.

J. Carruthers asked who will replace the VP Administration if the VP Administration is replacing the President. L. Grimes replied that a replacement will be appointed and ratified by the Board.

K. McMurray asked how the VP Administration and the other VP positions will be dealt with in the case of the President losing a recall election.

D. Leibu stated that he would encourage the members of the Board to vote against this proposal. He stated that he does not understand how changing the contents of the package here and there really simplifies things for the students. He stated that he believed the purpose of this meeting was to clarify the presentation of the document to the students because of the difficulty they had in grasping it all. He added that the majority of issues being discussed here, however, are issues of content and not presentation.

D. Leibu stated that the only issue that touches upon the question of how to make the students understand the package is that of how many questions will be asked. He added that in asking several questions, the students get the optioning of choosing what they like and building a constitution.

Item #1 Name change from CUSA to CSU

K. McMurray stated that it is the name of the Association that is important and not the acronym.

D. Leibu stated that changing the name of the Association requires a two-thirds majority referendum since it is a change to the Companies' Charter and not a change to the constitution. He asked how having this one referendum question will satisfy the legalities involved in changing the name of the corporation.

L. Grimes stated that if the points are separated into ten questions the likelihood of there being a problem is obviously less, and if there is one single question, the parts that require two-thirds will still require two-thirds and if the overall package does not get two-thirds it can't be assumed that that particular section hasn't received the required number.

L. Podgurny asked that as far as the presentation of the question, will the questions that require two-thirds be grouped together.

E. Kamukama asked if the whole package gets less than two-thirds does the whole package fail. D. Leibu replied that in that case parts of the package will be illegal because you cannot do this without two-thirds.

Item #2 Changing Board of Directors to Council of Representatives

No discussion.

Item #3 Matching the term of office to the fiscal year

No discussion.

Item #4 Changing the Co-Presidential system to an elected President and Vice-President

E. Kamukama stated that he is worried that the VP who is elected by the students can be removed by the President and that the President can then appoint a VP. He asked if this was not a contradiction. L. Grimes replied that removal for cause is subject to ratification from the Board and in the event of a vacancy the Board will ratify the Presidents appointee by a two-thirds vote.

E. Kamukama asked if it was appropriate that an individual elected by a constituency of students can be removed by someone other than this constituency. L. Grimes replied that it is understood when they are running that there is a President who is the bottom line and that s/he will have an elected assistant who in the event of their absence has a

mandate to take office, but it is understood that that person is subject to the president and can be removed for cause by the President subject to ratification by the Board. Ratification of the Board is a safeguard. If the VP resigns then the President can appoint a replacement also subject to ratification by the Board.

J. Carruthers asked how an elected official can be replaced by appointment. L. Grimes replied that students must elect a team so that in the event of a vacancy of the President the person who will step in knows what the responsibilities are, has campaigned and is willing to do the job. This will avoid a potential stalemate that could occur if the one of the positions vacated is filled by an individual with whom it is impossible to work.

A. Kennedy asked how long will an appointed person be in charge before an election. L. Grimes replied that it would be thirty days later. She added that the members should keep in mind that the students are being asked to vote on the spirit of the type of leadership, removal process, etc., and that after the vote the hard work of forming the Regulations will begin, which will take two to three months.

D. Leibu asked if it is really possible to pass a referendum without ever having the students vote on the content of the constitution. He stated that he did not think this was possible. L. Grimes replied that she thinks it is possible. She added that the legal opinion and legal budget has been exhausted and that she proposes going to the students.

A. Feldman stated that the clauses must be confirmed by the students. He stated that in the strictest sense, he does not believe that this means the students must vote on the exact wording, but the spirit of the clause must not change.

A. Kennedy stated that the benefits of the Presidential system have weight.

L. Grimes stated that with the Presidential system, one person could sweep into office very easily without any debate or coordination with another. She added that the only problem in the current system is that there is no easy resolution when there is a dispute because it is unclear who is in charge. She stated that in the new system, the President will have the bottom line.

A. Kennedy asked what will happen if the VP Administration resigns. L. Grimes replied that the President will appoint a replacement.

D. Leibu stated that he felt the students were not being given a clear alternative choice with this clause. He added that if the students are asked if they want one President, and they say no, then the current system can be modified, but this solution does not really present an alternative to the current system because all the benefits that are expressed in the document are false.

D. Leibu stated that there is not really a system of checks and balances if the VP cannot remove the President, there is one person in charge and another who follows. He added that the issue of having one person sweep in is a non-issue because the Co-Presidential team is usually two friends, so in the process of running there is no check and

balance.

D. Leibu stated that he strongly recommends the students be given a chance to vote on the Presidential system. He stated that he does not feel this proposal is a significant justification to stick with a system that has presented problems year after year. He added that anyone could certainly campaign against it if they do not agree with it.

K. McMurry stated that he has a problem with the fact that one elected official can remove another elected official. He stated that this has potentially more flaws than the current system.

C. Vieira stated that she also feels there is no check and balance and that the President has the power to force the VP to agree with her/him, especially if the President can persuade the Board to uphold the decision by two-thirds.

L. Grimes stated that in the Presidential system there is no chance for a check and balance. If you have a vice-president who has integrity and will fight, s/he will speak out. She stated for example that had she been a real VP in the Nero administration, the whistle would have been blown a long time ago at any cost, regardless of is she had gotten fired.

L. Grimes stated that a check and balance isn't always one person being able to veto the other person, but being able to confront the other with research and an elected position and saying that something is wrong and that the whistle will be blown. She added that it is also not the case that running mates are always friends.

L. Grimes stated that she and Philip have contradicted each other. She added that if a team runs there is more work involved, and there is compromise, and compromise is very important. If it cannot be done from day one it is going to be very difficult to run an association with VPs and a Board of Directors who may not always agree with you.

A. Feldman stated that the Board must only decide which question will be sent to the students, and that the merits of either system should not be debated at this moment.

C. Vieira stated that the content of the proposed constitution keeps changing, and she therefore believes that it should indeed be talked about.

E. Kamukama asked if perhaps all the alternatives should go to the students.

A. Feldman clarified that the merits of the currents system as opposed to any alternative systems should not be debated.

C. Vieira stated that she is not convinced about the check and balance system. She stated that L. Grimes mentioned the integrity of the VP, but if the President has integrity then there is no need for a check and balance.

P. Dalton stated that check and balance is not always in the case of an extreme situation, that checks occur everyday. He added that if the VP and the President are working well together, there is someone with a mandate from the students to replace the President in the case of illness, death, or whatever. If they are not working well as a team, the bottom line is with the President and the VP will go, and as a President, that is reasonable.

C. Vieira stated that her point has just been proven, if checks already exist there is no need for a VP Administration.

L. Grimes stated that without someone who is elected there is no hope of a real check and balance system.

L. Podgurny stated that under any system people can get away with things if they want to. He stated that this proposed system is halfway between the system of two Presidents with five VPs below them and one President with five VPs below him/her, and that this halfway system can be considered as one that will work.

G. Dubrow stated that usually checks and balance will occur between the President's office and the Board of Directors, so there is no need for checks and balances between the President and the VP.

M. Giles stated that it is really the Board of Directors' duty to act as a check and balance to the cabinet.

D. Leibu stated that what should be presented to the students is a clear system that is different from the current system. He added that the original question that was presented a few weeks ago was well thought out, was approved by the lawyer, and outlined a system where the President was balanced by the Board of Directors. There was no doubt as to who has power and where the power lies. It is the Board of Directors duty to make sure that the President is assuming her/his responsibilities.

D. Leibu stated that this new proposal is ill thought out and that it has some implications that are not well taken into account, especially regarding removal from office and where responsibilities lie. He added that it is no longer clear as to how much of a mandate the Board of Directors has in providing checks and balance. Daniel stated that it is time to give students a clear and really different choice to elect one person.

L. Grimes stated that she would like to reinforce to the Board the values of a Co-Presidential system. She added that there is broader representation, there is an opportunity for two people to work together, that students are able to see more qualities that they like in two people, that it is more difficult for two people to get elected and shows compromise which is very important.

J. Carruthers asked if broader representation can be ensured, for example by having two people from different parts of the university run together. L. Grimes replied that it is necessary to trust the students to elect a team that will display diversity.

D. Leibu stated that in essence, this proposal is the Co-Presidential system.

L. Podgurny asked for a straw vote on this issue.

It was determined that four people preferred the Board present a Presidential system and five pcople preferred to present a Presidential/VP Administration system.

Item #5 Replacing an open number of executives with a permanent executive

A. Feldman suggested that this question be changed to allow for the possible changes in the VP Administration position that will depend on the previous point regarding the election of a President and a VP Administration.

K. McMurray asked which portfolio CCSL appointments would fall under. L. Grimes replied that duty will fall in the VP Services portfolio.

P. Dalton stated that in the event that there is no VP Administration elected with the President, the VP Administration be included in this point.

K. McMurray stated that he is concerned about the possibilities of loopholes in the case of certain resolutions passing and certain resolutions failing.

L. Podgurny stated that it seems as if point #4 and point #5 should be discussed as one question because the change in electing a President and a VP Administration is reflected in point #5.

P. Dalton stated that this point is to entrench the VPs in the constitution, so as to avoid an open number of VPs in the future.

L. Podgurny stated that there is already a default question about that as far as what is being changed compared to what has already been discussed, which is why point #4 and point #5 should be considered together. He added that if the idea of a VP and President running together is not approved there is always the default question of the President which has already been discussed.

A. Feldman stated that if the Board decides to split these questions, the adjustments are going to have to be made mutatis mutandis to allow for the possibility that some clauses may pass and some may not.

M. Giles stated that if the original package is looked at, where the VP system was adopted, the six VPs are outlined in this package. This should mean that mutatis mutandis, if the other system fails, the six VPs are still enshrined.

G. Grenier suggested that the Board continue with the spirit of the resolutions and not the actual wording.

D. Leibu stated that one of the reasons the questions that are printed now are more complicated than the original ones

is because the provisions to make each question independent are in those questions because they were worded very carefully and it was made sure that they were each independent. He added that if modifications are made in this package to make the questions independent, you will find that the questions will become just as complicated. He stated that he does not think anything is being simplified for any student by revising the package in this way, in fact the Board of Directors is being made to redo the work that Francois Longpre did two weeks ago.

L. Grimes stated that the students are being given something that they can actually see and understand the concepts. She stated that she does not believe it is fair to have a student who may not have attended the debates or read the material in the papers vote. She added that originally, it was only the "whereas" sections of the document that were to be on the ballot, and the full document would be posted in the polling station.

L. Grimes stated that most members of the Board were elected on a mandate of change, to bring about reforms to make the association and the constitution more manageable and more legitimate, and that is what the students said to go ahead and do when they voted for you. She added that what is being done here is bringing the concepts for change back and asking if the students like them or not. She stated that it is not fair to walk through every legal bit of text.

C. Vieira stated that she believed the original idea was to have a constitution a ten-year old would be able to understand. L. Grimes replied that at that time an entirely new constitution was being considered, but that job was too tremendous to have completed in the time allowable. She added that this package consists of very constructive ways to put dramatic reform into the constitution while it is in some evolutionary process. She added that the constitution will ultimately come back to the students, perhaps not in this term but in the following term, and the seed of thought and vision is there. In the meantime, however, there has to be a tone and a spirit set for constitutional reform.

D. Leibu stated that he thinks it is very disappointing that the meaning or the intent behind the referendum is leaking out week by week and the closer the dates become, the less significance it seems to have. He stated that when the project was first embarked upon, the students were going to get a constitution that they could read and improve, and that could replace the current constitution. The next step was that they were going to get ten options that they could look over and decide which they want and which they don't want. Now in the third phase they are going to be presented with a package deal of twelve sentences which says this is one question, please accept what we think should be the reforms.

D. Leibu stated that there is not any real choice involved. He added that the significant impact the changes are going to have are unknowable because it is not spelled out anywhere. He added that there are many students who do not want to read the package, and that he has no problem with putting the "whereas"s on the ballot, but there are a few students who do want to know what change they are affecting in their association, and what the consequences would be. He added that if he were to read this on the ballot he would have no clue as to how it will affect the constitution and no clue as to what will happen to the student association after it passes.

G. Grenier stated that it is the unfortunate reality of the situation that after trying very hard for almost a year to get students to care, they don't. She added that the chances are that those who read this and want to care are those that have their own constitutions at home and know what's going on. She stated that she cannot honestly name five students who have their own constitution and who care.

G. Grenier stated if five students who are not on the Board and care could be found, that D. Leibu's point is valid and makes sense. But the reality, as L. Grimes found in going to students and showing them the package and asking what they thought, is not even that they don't care, but that it is far beyond them. They do not have the time to think about such things. She added that as an elected decisionmaker, if the decisionmaker thinks it should be done a certain way and cares enough to do it in a certain way, then the decision should be left in the decisionmakers hands.

G. Grenier stated that students should indeed be given choice, but the reality is that very few of them want it. She stated that she feels as a group of people who do care, the Board should bring the students as little information as possible so that they will not feel bombarded and turned off.

L. Podgurny stated that the Board should not harp on the fact that it will be one question, because the reforms can very easily be split into ten questions. He added that the package is the last thing that should be considered and what the Board should be looking at now is the individual reforms and the way those will be presented. He added that it is the concept and idea that is most important.

P. Batchoun stated that she found the ballot much clearer by having the separate questions all on one page, especially since in that case the entire package need not be voted against if there is only one resolution that is not acceptable.

P. Dalton stated that in the Charlottetown Accord, citizens were not required to vote on the legal text, but on a summary. He added that a summary of the changes is really all that is necessary for students and that if the students are very keen, they can by all means read the exact wording.

C. Bolh stated that she agreed with P. Dalton and also that she also believes the questions should be split.

A. Feldman stated that it seems to be the general consensus of the Board that as simple a ballot as possible should be presented to the students, and the legal details will be available for those who are interested. He stated that he would recommend not to debate ad infinitum.

Item #6 Voting rights of members

C. Vieira asked if the VPs are considered to be part of the student government, and if they have full voting rights.
A. Feldman stated he believed this point to mean that people who are elected to positions do not have to register for classes in order to complete their office.

L. Podgurny asked if full members can also run. A. Feldman stated that the current constitution says one has to be a member to run for office, whereas this says one is a member if one is in office. He stated that technically, according to the constitution as long as one is in office one may run.

A. Feldman stated that the wording should be clarified, and that he understands the intent to be that if someone is elected into a position they can remain in that position without registering for classes, but should not be able to run for re-election if they are not registered for classes.

C. Vieira stated that her point of contention was related to the appointed positions. She asked if, for example, the VP Academic would be considered to be appointed to a post in the student government, and if so, that person would be a full voting member.

It was clarified that those people would not be full voting members of the Board.

A. Feldman stated that a person would have to be a registered student of Concordia originally to be elected or appointed to a position in the student government. He stated that the problem with this wording is that a person retains membership status after the election or appointment, in which case the person is still eligible for re-election or re-appointment.

K. McMurray stated that in his mind this point merely underscores a current ambiguity in the constitution and that it is not really an amendment.

D. Leibu stated that he feels all of the discussion up until this point points out very clearly that this package is not well thought out. He stated that if the student government is going to present a package that says this is what the government thinks you should accept, the government should really be concerned about what is being presented. He added that the content of these questions is really quite up in the air.

D. Leibu stated that it is good to make the actual amendments available come election time, but he would be very hesitant to vote on these questions without understanding what the repercussions would be. He stated that it would be much better to stick with the original package which is sufficiently different from the current constitution that the necessary reforms will get done. He stated that it is the job of the YES committee to simplify the amendments for the students and make sure they are presented in a clear and legible manner. He added that simplicity should not be an excuse to present the students with a package that is as incomplete, as full of loopholes and as dangerous, if not more so than the current constitution. He urged the Board to go with the original package.

Item #7 The Electoral Board

L. Grimes reviewed Point #7

A. Feldman stated that he believed the concern being dealt with here is the way the package will be presented. He stated that eleven pages of questions is not good. He stated he believed the intent of this meeting was to simplify the package and give the students one thing, perhaps a legal size page with all of the questions in simple form.

L. Grimes stated that there are other goals she would like the Board to consider, namely to have an elected President with an elected vice-president and to not have the Board of Directors be a body which is one-third appointed, so that every member has arrived at the Board by the same means. She stated that the representatives from the Senate of Faculty Associations will have ex officio non-voting status on this Board so the concerns of ECA and CASA for direct contact with the Board will be addressed.

L. Grimes stated that a problem in the previous package is that there is no way of questioning how a third of the Board is appointed.

A. Feldman suggested that the Board make a decision on the fundamental questions. He stated that there are only two changes in actual content or effect from what was previously done. He suggested the Board decide on each of those understanding that to change the effect of the previous questions will take a two-thirds majority of those present. He stated that he believes the questions can be written by the CRO based on the actual text, and that the questions can be a summary of the content and not the content word for word.
L. Grimes stated that there are other changes in the removal procedure that need to be considered.

MOTION TO GO OUT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by: L. Podgurny
Seconded by: P. Dalton

VOTE ON MOTION 11/0/1 CARRIED

G. Dubrow summarized the changes in a separate document (BD-D2). There was some discussion of the procedure to be followed in passing the new package, and it was clarified that a two-thirds majority vote is needed to amend something that has already been voted upon. He reviewed BD-D2 point-by-point.

There was general confusion regarding the documents presented, followed by an examination of the original constitution package, the constitution package presented tonight and G. Dubrow's summary of the changes, and much discussion as to how the motions should be worded and which documents should be looked at.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item #4 in tonight's package replace page 8 in the package presented at the February 18, 1994 meeting.

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: K. McMurray

VOTE ON MOTION 7/3/1 CARRIED

E. Kamukama noted on record as being against this motion.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item #5 in tonight's document replace page 9 in the package presented at the February 18, 1994 meeting.

Motion 646

WHEREAS this amendment would replace the current system of an open number of vice-presidents with one in which there would be a permanent executive appointed by the President and ratified by a majority vote of the Council;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the CUSA by-laws be amended by replacing Section 6.2.1 with:

"There shall be five Vice Presidents bearing the following titles: V.P. Academic, V.P. CUSAcorp, V.P. Finance, V.P. Information, V.P. Services who shall have the powers and perform the duties incidental to their office and shall perform such further duties as may be required by the President or as may be determined by Regulation. These Vice Presidents shall have ex officio non-voting status on the Council."

This resolution shall come into force on June 1, 1994 and for the purposes of the upcoming Annual General Elections.

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: P. Dalton

VOTE ON MOTION 10/0/1 CARRIED

BE IT RESOLVED THAT page 10 on the package presented at the February 18, 1994 meeting now state "All association members elected or appointed to posts in the student government need only be members at the time of their election."

Motion 647

WHEREAS this amendment would allow all association members elected to or appointed to posts in the student government to remain in office without being enrolled in courses;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT all association members elected to or appointed to posts in the

student government need only be members of the Association at the time of their election or appointment to remain in office.

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: K. McMurray

C. Vieira suggested the motion be amended by adding "or appointment" to "at the time of their election."

The amendment is friendly.

VOTE ON MOTION UNANIMOUS

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item #7 in tonight's document replace page 7 and 7b of the package presented at the February 18, 1994 meeting.

Motion 648

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Article 7 of the CUSA By-laws be replaced with the following:

"A five (5) member Electoral Board be formed to organize and administer elections, by-elections and referenda of the Union. The Electoral Board will be members of the Union who are appointed by a two-thirds majority vote of the Council, upon nomination by the V.P. Administration, who shall chair the Board but shall not have a vote.

The Electoral Board's term of office runs for one year from their appointment or until their successors are appointed. Vacancies are filled by a two-thirds majority vote of the Council of Representatives for the remainder of the term of the member being replaced."

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: K. McMurray

VOTE ON MOTION 9/1/1 CARRIED

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item #8 in tonight's document also replace all of pages 7 and 7b of the package presented at the February 18, 1994 meeting.

Motion 649

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Article 18 of the CUSA By-Laws be amended by replacing it with the following:

By reason of absence

Representatives failing to attend three regular meetings of the Council during a term of office are deemed to have resigned their office, but they stay in office in order to reoffer in a by-election to fill the vacancy.

By vote of the Council of Representatives

Representatives, the President and Vice President Administration may be recalled to election by an absolute two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of the Council for misappropriation of funds, dereliction of duties, violation of these by-laws or of the regulations. two week's written notice of the proposed recall must be given to the person subject to recall and to the Council indicating the cause for recall and the date, time and place of the meeting of the Council where the issue will be decided.

Vice-Presidents may be removed from office by a majority vote of the Council upon the recommendation of the President. One week's written notice of the proposed removal from office must be given to the person subject to removal and to the Council indicating the date, time and place of the meeting of the Council of Representatives where the issue will be decided.

In the case of the President losing a recall election all appointed Vice Presidents are deemed to have resigned, pending possible reappointment by the incoming President and ratification by the Council.

By petition of the members

Elected councilors and officers may be recalled to an election no later than thirty (30) days after the receipt of the Electoral Board chairman of a petition of 10% of the members of the faculty of the councillor or of all of the members of the Union respectively. The Electoral Board has sole authority to verify the validity of the petition, subject to Regulations governing this removal process.

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: C. Bolh

VOTE ON MOTION 10/1/0 CARRIED

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item #9 in tonight's document replace all of page 4 in the package presented at the February 19, 1994 meeting, bearing in mind that #10 in print in now # 9e.

Motion 650

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the CUSA By-Laws be amended by adding a new paragraph at the end of Section 5.5 as follows: "Regulations shall be policies of a permanent nature which may only be adopted, amended or rescinded by a two-thirds majority vote of the members of the Council of Representatives at a meeting specifically called for that purpose."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the CUSA By-laws be amended by replacing the first paragraph of Section 4.2 as follows: "The Annual General Meeting of members shall be held solely for the following purposes:

a) **announcement of the results of the Annual General Elections and any referenda or by-elections held concurrently, such announcements to take the form of a Chief Returning Officer's report;**
b) **release of the annual financial statements of the Union for the last fiscal year and the auditor's report thereon;**
c) **announcement of the auditors for the ensuing year; and**
d) **presentation of a written annual report from the President.**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Special By-Law B be amended to read, "the Association may own a profit making company."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT article 5.2.2 be amended by adding a new sentence at the end of article 5.2.2 as follows: "The collectivity of independent students is deemed to be a faculty for the purposes of representation on the Council."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT all seats that are uncontested in a general election or a by election will be subject to a YES/NO vote, that is to say, acclamations will not be permitted.

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: C. Vieira

VOTE ON MOTION UNANIMOUS

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the information under #5 in the reasons of the reasoned report starting with "In place of..." and ending with "for approval." become #10 in the new document and therefore replace page 5 in the package presented at the February 18, 1994 meeting.

Motion 651

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the CUSA By-laws be amended by adding a new section for the creation of a Senate of Faculty Associations: "A Senate of Faculty Associations should be formed. This group of three representatives from each faculty, including independent students, will elect a chair from among themselves and will have two functions: the power to review votes made by the Board of Directors (Council of Representatives) which they can send back to the Board (Council) for reconsideration and they will have the right to initiate legislation to send to the Board (Council) for approval.

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: L. Podgurny

VOTE ON MOTION 7/1/3 CARRIED

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the motion that replaced page 8 of the package presented at the February 19, 1994 meeting with Item #4 of the tonight's document be reconsidered.

Moved by: C. Bolh
Seconded by: S. Jawad

VOTE ON MOTION 6/3/2 CARRIED

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item #4 in tonight's package replace page 8 in the package presented at the February 18, 1994 meeting.

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: K. McMurray

VOTE ON MOTION 6/4/1 FAILED

BE IT RESOLVED THAT whereas Item #4 was rejected by the Board that the remaining Items be amended to reflect that change Mutatis Mutandis.

Moved by: P. Dalton
Seconded by: C. Vieira

VOTE ON MOTION 10/0/1 CARRIED

BE IT RESOLVED THAT all these Items will appear on one ballot with separate questions for each section, and that it be in it's simplest form on the ballot with the detailed

information provided for voters.

Moved by: L. Grimes
Seconded by: C. Bolh

VOTE ON MOTION **UNANIMOUS**

The Chair reminded the members that the changes made tonight cannot go into effect until the waivers signed by those who were not present at tonight's meeting have been received.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Moved by: L. Podgurny
Seconded by: J. Carruthers

VOTE ON MOTION **UNANIMOUS**

This meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:45 p.m.

G. Dubrow, Chair

M. Giles/G. Grenier/S. Segal, Secretary